



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,575	03/25/2004	Arjan De Mes	GB920030013US1	7131
46370	7590	07/07/2009		
SILVY ANNA MURPHY 100 TURNBERRY LANE CARY, NC 27518			EXAMINER MAHMOOD, REZWANUL	
			ART UNIT 2164	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/07/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/809,575	Applicant(s) DE MES, ARJAN	
	Examiner REZWANUL MAHMOOD	Art Unit 2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 April 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 34,35,37-39,41,46,47,49-51 and 53 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 34,35,37-39,41,46,47,49-51 and 53 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the communication filed on April 22, 2009.
Claims 34, 35, 37-39, 41, 46, 47, 49-51, and 53 are pending in this office action.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on April 22, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons:

Applicant argues that Sommerer, Pentikainen, and Van Der Meulen do not teach or even suggest the features "consists essentially of said list of names of said web sites in a chronological order based on a respective time since last visit by said user and said respective graphic next to a respective name of a respective web site having intensity that corresponds to said respective time since last visit by said user" and "consists essentially of said list of names of said web sites in a chronological order based on frequency of visits by said user and said respective graphic next to a respective name of a respective web site by said user".

Examiner respectfully disagrees all of the allegations as argued.
Examiner, in his previous office action, gave detail explanation of claimed limitation and pointed out exact locations in the cited prior art.

Examiner is entitled to give claim limitations their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification. See MPEP 2111 [R-1]

Interpretation of Claims-Broadest Reasonable Interpretation

During patent examination, the pending claims must be 'given the

Art Unit: 2164

broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.’ Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 162 USPQ 541,550-51 (CCPA 1969).

Sommerer teaches in Abstract lines 1-18, Paragraph 37 lines 1-16, Paragraph 38 lines 1-15, Paragraph 57 lines 1-32 displaying, in response to a search request for recently visited web sites received from a web browser within a client computer connected to a computer network, a list of names of web sites visited by a user of said client computer, said list of names of said web sites recently visited being displayed on a display screen of said client computer. However, Sommerer does not explicitly disclose displaying in an order based on a time since last visit by said user to a respective web site of said recently visited web sites displayed. The Pentikainen reference, teaches in Paragraph 100 lines 1-26 about a table of names of web sites viewable in an order based on a time since last visit by a user to a respective web site of the web sites displayed in table. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Sommerer with the teachings of Pentikainen for displaying a list of recently visited web site names in an order based on a time since last visit by a user to a respective web site of said recently visited web sites displayed in said list for controlling display of data in the form of content pages (Pentikainen: Paragraph 1, lines 5-6).

Sommerer in view of Pentikainen teaches displaying an ordered web site name list display wherein said ordered web site name list display consists essentially of said list of names of said web sites in a chronological order based on a respective time since last visit by said user (Sommerer: Abstract, lines 1-18; Paragraph 37, lines 1-16; Paragraph 38, lines 1-15; Paragraph 57, lines 1-32; Pentikainen: Paragraph 100, lines 1-26). However, Sommerer and Pentikainen do not explicitly disclose displaying next to each of said names of said web sites, a respective graphic having an intensity that corresponds to a respective time since last visit by said user to said each of said web sites displayed, said respective graphic next to a respective name of a respective web site having an intensity that corresponds to said respective time since last visit by said user. The Van Der Meulen reference, teaches in Paragraph 49 lines 14-43 and in Figures 2-3 about displaying next to each names of web sites a respective graphic having intensity that corresponds to the level of validity of the first path associated with each web site displayed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Sommerer and Pentikainen with the teachings of Van Der Meulen for displaying next to each of said names of said web sites, a respective graphic having an intensity that corresponds to a respective time since last visit by said user to said each of said web sites displayed, said respective graphic next to a respective name of a respective web site having an intensity that corresponds to said respective time since last visit by said user for enabling efficient update of a user interface element with time (Van Der Meulen:

Art Unit: 2164

Paragraph 9, lines 1-3).

For the above reasons, Examiner believed that rejection of the last Office action was proper.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 34, 35, 37-39, 41, 46, 47, 49-51, and 53 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sommerer (US Publication 2004/0003351) in view of Pentikainen (US Publication 2004/0073713) and in further view of Van Der Meulen (US Publication 2002/0129164).

With respect to claim 34, Sommerer discloses a method for displaying a web browsing history, said method comprising the steps of:

displaying, in response to a search request for recently visited web sites received from a web browser within a client computer connected to a computer network, a list of names of web sites visited by a user of said client computer, said list of names of said web sites recently visited being displayed on a display screen of said client computer (Sommerer: Abstract, lines 1-18; Paragraph 37, lines 1-16; Paragraph 38, lines 1-15; Paragraph 57, lines 1-32);

However, Sommerer does not explicitly disclose displaying in an order based on a time since last visit by said user to a respective web site of said recently visited web sites displayed.

The Pentikainen reference, discloses a table of names of web sites viewable in an order based on a time since last visit by a user to a respective web site of the web sites displayed (Pentikainen: Paragraph 100, lines 1-26).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Sommerer with the teachings of Pentikainen for displaying a list of recently visited web site names in an order based on a time since last visit by a user to a respective web site of said recently visited web sites displayed in said list for controlling display of data in the form of content pages (Pentikainen: Paragraph 1, lines 5-6).

Sommerer in view of Pentikainen discloses:

displaying an ordered web site name list display; wherein said ordered web site name list display consists essentially of said list of names of said web sites in a chronological order based on a respective time since last visit by said user (Sommerer: Abstract, lines 1-18; Paragraph 37, lines 1-16; Paragraph 38, lines 1-15; Paragraph 57, lines 1-32; Pentikainen: Paragraph 100, lines 1-26).

However, Sommerer and Pentikainen do not explicitly disclose:

displaying next to each of said names of said web sites, a respective graphic having an intensity that corresponds to a respective time since last visit by said user to said each of said web sites displayed, said respective graphic

Art Unit: 2164

next to a respective name of a respective web site having an intensity that corresponds to said respective time since last visit by said user.

The Van Der Meulen reference, discloses displaying next to each names of web sites a respective graphic having intensity that corresponds to the level of validity of the first path associated with each web site displayed (Van Der Meulen: Paragraph 49, lines 14-43; Figures 2-3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Sommerer and Pentikainen with the teachings of Van Der Meulen for displaying next to each of said names of said web sites, a respective graphic having an intensity that corresponds to a respective time since last visit by said user to said each of said web sites displayed, said respective graphic next to a respective name of a respective web site having an intensity that corresponds to said respective time since last visit by said user for enabling efficient update of a user interface element with time (Van Der Meulen: Paragraph 9, lines 1-3).

With respect to claim 35, Sommerer in view of Pentikainen and in further view of Van Der Meulen discloses a method as set forth in claim 34, wherein said intensity of said respective graphic next to a name of a respective newer web site in said list of names of web sites displayed on said display screen of said client computer is more intense for a newer web site more recently visited by said user than said intensity of said respective graphic next to another name of another older web site in said list of names of said web sites that corresponds to an older

Art Unit: 2164

web site less recently visited by said user (Sommerer: Abstract, lines 1-18; Paragraph 57, lines 1-32; Pentikainen: Paragraph 100, lines 1-26; Van Der Meulen: Paragraph 49, lines 14-43; Figures 2-3).

With respect to claim 37, Sommerer in view of Pentikainen and in further view of Van Der Meulen discloses a method as set forth in claim 35, wherein said respective graphic next to said respective newer web site in said list of names of said web sites adjoins with said another respective graphic next to said another older web site to form a gradient bar corresponding to said list of names of said recently visited web sites (Sommerer: Paragraph 57, lines 1-32; Van Der Meulen: Paragraph 49, lines 14-43; Figures 2-3; Here the graphics for multiple web site can adjoin each other to form a generally rectangular region perpendicular to the web site names, and combined with the various color intensities of the graphics can be similar to a gradient bar).

With respect to claim 38, Sommerer discloses a method for displaying a web browsing history, said method comprising the steps of:

displaying, in response to a search request for visited web sites received from a web browser within a client computer, a list of names of web sites visited by a user of said client computer, said list of names of said web sites being displayed on a display screen of said client computer connected to a computer network (Sommerer: Abstract, lines 1-18; Paragraph 37, lines 1-16; Paragraph 38, lines 1-15; Paragraph 57, lines 1-32);

Art Unit: 2164

However, Sommerer does not explicitly disclose displaying in an order based on frequency of visits by said user.

The Pentikainen reference, discloses a table of names of web sites viewable in an order based on frequency of visits by said user (Pentikainen: Paragraph 100, lines 1-26).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Sommerer with the teachings of Pentikainen for displaying a list of recently visited web site names in an order based on frequency of visits by said user for controlling display of data in the form of content pages (Pentikainen: Paragraph 1, lines 5-6).

Sommerer in view of Pentikainen discloses:

displaying ordered web site name list display consists essentially of said list of names of said web sites in a chronological order based on frequency of visits by said user (Sommerer: Abstract, lines 1-18; Paragraph 37, lines 1-16; Paragraph 38, lines 1-15; Paragraph 57, lines 1-32; Pentikainen: Paragraph 100, lines 1-26).

However, Sommerer and Pentikainen do not explicitly disclose:

displaying next to each of said names of said web sites, a respective graphic having an intensity that corresponds to a frequency of visits by said user to a respective web site in said list of names of said web sites displayed to provide an ordered web site name list display, said respective graphic next to a respective name of a respective web site having an intensity that corresponds to said frequency of visits to said respective web site by said user.

The Van Der Meulen reference, discloses displaying next to each names of web sites a respective graphic having intensity that corresponds to the level of validity of the first path associated with each web site displayed (Van Der Meulen: Paragraph 49, lines 14-43; Figures 2-3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Sommerer and Pentikainen with the teachings of Van Der Meulen for displaying next to each of said names of said web sites, a respective graphic having an intensity that corresponds to a frequency of visits by said user to a respective web site in said list of names of said web sites displayed to provide an ordered web site name list display, said respective graphic next to a respective name of a respective web site having an intensity that corresponds to said frequency of visits to said respective web site by said user for enabling efficient update of a user interface element with time (Van Der Meulen: Paragraph 9, lines 1-3).

With respect to claim 39, Sommerer in view of Pentikainen and in further view of Van Der Meulen discloses a method as set forth in claim 38, wherein said intensity of said respective graphic next to a name of a respective web site in said list of names of web sites displayed on said display screen of said client computer is more intense for a web site more frequently visited by said user than said intensity of said respective graphic next to another name of another web site in said list of names of said web sites that corresponds to another web site less frequently visited by said user (Sommerer: Abstract, lines 1-18; Paragraph 57,

Art Unit: 2164

lines 1-32; Pentikainen: Paragraph 100, lines 1-26; Van Der Meulen: Paragraph 49, lines 14-43; Figures 2-3).

With respect to claim 41, Sommerer in view of Pentikainen and in further view of Van Der Meulen discloses a method as set forth in claim 39, wherein said respective graphic next to said respective web site in said list of names of said web sites adjoins with said another respective graphic next to said another web site to form a gradient bar corresponding to said list of names of said web sites frequently visited (Sommerer: Paragraph 57, lines 20-27; Van Der Meulen: Paragraph 49, lines 14-43; Figures 2-3; Here the graphics for multiple web site can adjoin each other to form a generally rectangular region perpendicular to the web site names, and combined with the various color intensities of the graphics can be similar to a gradient bar).

With respect to claim 46, Sommerer discloses a computer program product stored on a computer readable storage medium for displaying to a user a web browsing history on a client computer system connected to a network and having a central processing unit (Sommerer: Figure 12), said computer program product comprising:

- a computer readable storage medium (Sommerer: Figure 12);

- first program instructions to display, on a display screen of said client computer system and responsive to a search request for recently visited web sites received from a web browser within said client computer system, a list of

Art Unit: 2164

names of web sites recently visited by a user of said client computer system, said list of names of said web sites being displayed on a display screen of said client computer system (Sommerer: Abstract, lines 1-18; Paragraph 37, lines 1-16; Paragraph 38, lines 1-15; Paragraph 57, lines 1-32);

However, Sommerer does not explicitly disclose displaying in an order based on a time since last visit by said user to a respective web site of said recently visited web sites displayed.

The Pentikainen reference, discloses a table of names of web sites viewable in an order based on a time since last visit by a user to a respective web site of the web sites displayed (Pentikainen: Paragraph 100, lines 1-26).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Sommerer with the teachings of Pentikainen for displaying a list of recently visited web site names in an order based on a time since last visit by a user to a respective web site of said recently visited web sites displayed in said list for controlling display of data in the form of content pages (Pentikainen: Paragraph 1, lines 5-6).

Sommerer in view of Pentikainen discloses:

displaying an ordered web site name list display; wherein said ordered web site name list display consists essentially of said list of names of said web sites in a chronological order based on a respective time since last visit by said user (Sommerer: Abstract, lines 1-18; Paragraph 37, lines 1-16; Paragraph 38, lines 1-15; Paragraph 57, lines 1-32; Pentikainen: Paragraph 100, lines 1-26).

However, Sommerer and Pentikainen do not explicitly disclose:

Art Unit: 2164

second program instructions to display, next to each of said names of said web sites, of a respective graphic having an intensity that corresponds to a respective time since last visit by said user to said each of said web sites displayed to provide an ordered web site name list display; said respective graphic next to a respective name of a respective web site having an intensity that corresponds to said respective time since last visit by said user.

The Van Der Meulen reference, however, discloses displaying next to each names of web sites a respective graphic having intensity that corresponds to the level of validity of the first path associated with each web site displayed (Van Der Meulen: Paragraph 49, lines 14-43; Figures 2-3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Sommerer and Pentikainen with the teachings of Van Der Meulen for displaying next to each of said names of said web sites, a respective graphic having an intensity that corresponds to a respective time since last visit by said user to said each of said web sites displayed, said respective graphic next to a respective name of a respective web site having an intensity that corresponds to said respective time since last visit by said user for enabling efficient update of a user interface element with time (Van Der Meulen: Paragraph 9, lines 1-3).

Sommerer in view of Pentikainen and in further view of Van Der Meulen discloses:

said first and second program instructions are recorded on said storage medium for execution by said central processing unit of said client computer

Art Unit: 2164

system for displaying said web browsing history to said user (Sommerer: Figure 12; Van Der Meulen: Figure 4).

With respect to claim 47, Sommerer in view of Pentikainen and in further view of Van Der Meulen discloses a computer program product as set forth in claim 46, wherein said intensity of said respective graphic next to a name of a respective newer web site in said list of names of web sites displayed on said display screen of said client computer is more intense for a newer web site more recently visited by said user than said intensity of said respective graphic next to another name of another older web site in said list of names of web sites that corresponds to an older web site less recently visited by said user (Sommerer: Abstract, lines 1-18; Paragraph 57, lines 1-32; Pentikainen: Paragraph 100, lines 1-26; Van Der Meulen: Paragraph 49, lines 14-43; Figures 2-3).

With respect to claim 49, Sommerer in view of Pentikainen and in further view of Van Der Meulen discloses a computer program product as set forth in claim 47, wherein said respective graphic next to said respective newer web site in said list of names of said web sites adjoins with said another respective graphic next to said another older web site to form a gradient bar corresponding to said list of names of said web sites (Sommerer: Paragraph 57, lines 20-27; Van Der Meulen: Paragraph 49, lines 14-43; Figures 2-3; Here the graphics for multiple web site can adjoin each other to form a generally rectangular region perpendicular to the web site names, and combined with the various color

Art Unit: 2164

intensities of the graphics can be similar to a gradient bar).

With respect to claim 50, Sommerer discloses a computer program product stored on a computer readable storage medium for displaying to a user a web browsing history on a client computer system connected to a network and having a central processing unit (Sommerer: Figure 12), said computer program product comprising:

a computer readable storage medium (Sommerer: Figure 12);

first program instructions to display, on a display screen of said client computer system and responsive to a search request for visited web sites received from a web browser within said client computer system, a list of names of web sites visited by a user of said client computer system, said list of names of said web sites being displayed on a display screen of said client computer system (Sommerer: Abstract, lines 1-18; Paragraph 37, lines 1-16; Paragraph 38, lines 1-15; Paragraph 57, lines 1-32);

However, Sommerer does not explicitly disclose displaying in an order based on frequency of visits by said user.

The Pentikainen reference, discloses a table of names of web sites viewable in an order based on frequency of visits by said user (Pentikainen: Paragraph 100, lines 1-26).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Sommerer with the teachings of Pentikainen for displaying a list of recently visited web site

Art Unit: 2164

names in an order based on frequency of visits by said user for controlling display of data in the form of content pages (Pentikainen: Paragraph 1, lines 5-6).

Sommerer in view of Pentikainen discloses:

displaying ordered web site name list display consists essentially of said list of names of said web sites in a chronological order based on frequency of visits by said user (Sommerer: Abstract, lines 1-18; Paragraph 37, lines 1-16; Paragraph 38, lines 1-15; Paragraph 57, lines 1-32; Pentikainen: Paragraph 100, lines 1-26).

However, Sommerer and Pentikainen do not explicitly disclose:

second program instructions to display, next to each of said names of said web sites, of a respective graphic having an intensity that corresponds to a frequency of visits by said user to a respective web site in said list of names of said web sites displayed to provide an ordered web site name list display; said respective graphic next to a respective name of said respective web site having an intensity that corresponds to said frequency of visits to said respective web site by said user;

The Van Der Meulen reference, discloses displaying next to each names of web sites a respective graphic having intensity that corresponds to the level of validity of the first path associated with each web site displayed (Van Der Meulen: Paragraph 49, lines 14-43; Figures 2-3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Sommerer and Pentikainen with the teachings of Van Der Meulen for a second program

Art Unit: 2164

instructions to display, next to each of said names of said web sites, of a respective graphic having an intensity that corresponds to a frequency of visits by said user to a respective web site in said list of names of said web sites displayed to provide an ordered web site name list display; said respective graphic next to a respective name of said respective web site having an intensity that corresponds to said frequency of visits to said respective web site by said user for enabling efficient update of a user interface element with time (Van Der Meulen: Paragraph 9, lines 1-3).

Sommerer in view of Pentikainen and in further view of Van Der Meulen discloses:

said first and second program instructions are recorded on said storage medium for execution by said central processing unit of said client computer system for displaying said web browsing history to said user (Sommerer: Figure 12; Van Der Meulen: Figure 4).

With respect to claim 51, Sommerer in view of Pentikainen and in further view of Van Der Meulen discloses a computer program product as set forth in claim 50, wherein said intensity of said respective graphic next to a name of a respective web site in said list of names of web sites displayed on said display screen of said client computer is more intense for a web site more frequently visited by said user than said intensity of said respective graphic next to another name of another web site in said list of names of said web sites that corresponds to another web site less frequently visited by said user (Sommerer: Abstract,

Art Unit: 2164

lines 1-18; Paragraph 57, lines 1-32; Pentikainen: Paragraph 100, lines 1-26; Van Der Meulen: Paragraph 49, lines 14-43; Figures 2-3).

With respect to claim 53, Sommerer in view of Pentikainen and in further view of Van Der Meulen discloses a computer program product as set forth in claim 51, wherein said respective graphic next to said respective web site in said list of names of web sites adjoins with said another respective graphic next to said another web site to form a gradient bar corresponding to list of names of said web sites (Sommerer: Paragraph 57, lines 1-32; Van Der Meulen: Paragraph 49, lines 14-43; Figures 2-3; Here the graphics for multiple web site can adjoin each other to form a generally rectangular region perpendicular to the web site names, and combined with the various color intensities of the graphics can be similar to a gradient bar).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be

Art Unit: 2164

calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2164

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to REZWANUL MAHMOOD whose telephone number is (571)272-5625. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F 10 A.M. - 5 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571)272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/R. M./
Examiner, Art Unit 2164

July 1, 2009

/Charles Rones/

Application/Control Number: 10/809,575

Page 21

Art Unit: 2164

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2164